Extra! Eliz. Bentley Lets Slip the Truth About Wire-Tapping, See Page Two

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I, NUMBER 45 DECEMBER 14, 1953 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Evaluating the Eisenhower Bombshell:

Diplomacy a la B. B. D. & O.

At the very entrance of the difficult path toward peace lie two similar problems. One is the unification of Korea, the other the unification of Germany. These cannot be separated from each other or from the broader context of strategic relations between the two great Powers.

If the Russians were sure, for example, that peace had been made in the Far East, they might be willing to release their hold on Eastern Germany. But it would be folly for them to give up Eastern Germany if there is still danger in the East, for any resumption of hostilities might flare up into world war. Eastern Germany is an additional buffer protecting the borders of the Soviet Union.

There is a similar perspective from Peking. Korea has always been a minor concern of the Chinese Communists, a distinct diversion of their strength away from Formosa and internal construction. A proposal for the unification of Korea and for neutralization would take a military liability off their hands. But such a solution makes sense only if there is to be stability in the Far East. On the other hand, if war is a possibility, if Formosa is to be used as a springboard for intervention, then it hardly makes sense for the Chinese to move back to the Yalu and release the entire Korean peninsula for possible use as an avenue of invasion.

What blocks world peace is that the American government insists on approaching each of these problems in isolation. It wants the Russians to give up Eastern Germany and release their hold on Austria without assuring them of peace in the Far East or even that German bases would not be used as springboards for a new war of "liberation." At the same time, in the Far East, our government wants the Chinese to relinquish the Communist hold on Korea and abandon historic claims to Formosa with no assurance in return of recognition and stable relations.

We are trying to get something for nothing. We do not wish even to give paper promises in return, as shown by the cold shoulder Washington gave Adenauer last summer when he fished about for some "non-aggression" formula with which to sugarcoat for the Russians the loss of the East German buffer. Our desire to dictate instead of negotiating is what haunts our allies, and it is this which must have been the preoccupation of the British and French at Bermuda. They want a formula which might possibly lead to success at the forthcoming negotiations in Berlin. Dulles, on the other hand, merely wants to get the talking over with as rapidly as possible in order to press on with German rearmament and after that with the big push eastward.

When this picture is looked at in the context of the atom and hydrogen bomb, the outlook is frightful. For resumption of the old German-Slav struggle in the area of atomic warfare, with the U. S., China and Western Europe drawn in, threatens—literally—the destruction of world civilization.

Against this background, it must have been furiously frustrating for Churchill at Bermuda to find serious discussion of these serious questions sidetracked in favor of preparing the gaudy pinwheel of a firecracker President Eisenhower was to set off at the U.N. The President's proposal in its original form, according to British sources, would have been another childish attempt to frighten the Russians with threats of how many and how potent were the atomic weapons in American hands. This was said to have been softened on Churchill's insistence in favor of the "constructive" aspect of the Eisenhower address.

In assessing this, the President's desire for peace and his sincerity need not be questioned. But the naivete is evident enough. If his proposal was intended to change the subject and to confuse the public mind, to give Washington the initiative over Moscow in the headlines, it was well fabricated. It is pure B.B.D.&O.—Burton, Barton, Durstine & Osborne—American publicity and advertising at its chrome-plated best. But it is not diplomacy.

We cannot make up our minds whether to let private American industry in on atomic development for peacetime use. We are unwilling to share our secrets with our closest ally, the British. Ever since we scrapped UNRRA, we have been against giving our help to the rest of the world through international organizations. We hobbled the World Bank and kept Point 4 out of the UN. Suddenly it is proposed that through the UN we set up an agency in which our scientists and Russia's will share the work and the secrets of atomic power development! If Russia ever accepted this, Congress would reject it.

How can Powers arming to the teeth against each other at the same time work together, sharing atomic secrets? How can we oppose exery effort to relax world tension, and at the same time put forward a plan which the ever suspicious Russians (and our ever suspicious Congress) could accept only after a period of successful international cooperation on much less touchy subjects?

This is psychological warfare, not peacemaking. The Russians by their first furious reaction have already fallen into the trap. And with only a few weeks to that crucial Berlin conference, the air will again be filled with the mutual recriminations the enemies of peace and the advocates of German rearmament so fervently desire.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• *Editor and Publisher*, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, $5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, $6; England and Continental Europe, $10 by 1st class mail, $15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, $10 by first class mail, $20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

December 14, 1953 Vol. 1, No. 45

Round the Capitol and the Globe

Towards Full Emancipation: Our readers, we are sure, do not need to be briefed on the school segregation case reargued last week before the U.S. Supreme Court. Nothing is more clear in our generation than the steady progress of the Negro to full emancipation. The South is waging a losing battle—and its leaders know it. Despite the new millionaire Republicans of Texas, the ballot has proven its potency. Both the Democratic and Republican parties through two successive Attorneys General have been compelled by the political power of the Negro to oppose Jim Crow in the schools. The reappearance of John W. Davis, already a half-forgotten figure, to argue for segregation was a symbol. Davis in 1936 was the American Liberty League, and the basic liberties it espoused seems now to have included the "liberty" to keep the Negro down. We believe the hydraulic force of political power and human aspiration will refashion the law to their purpose. We even expect to see the day when the National Press Club, last citadel of segregation in the national capital, admits Negroes to membership, though at the present pace this may be shortly after the Daughters of the Confederacy takes in the NAACP.

Crucial Difference: While American Congressmen junket to Formosa and make pilgrimages to Bonn, a French parliamentary delegation has flown behind the Iron Curtain for a visit to Poland. This was perhaps the most poorly covered story of the week, and we are probably the only publication in America to give the names and party affiliation of this nine-man delegation. There were two Radical Socialists, former Premier Daladier and Verneuil; two Gaullists, Jacques Soustelle, formerly Secretary General of de Gaulle's R.P.F., and Lebon; two Socialists, Darou and Conte; and one delegate each from the Catholic M.R.P. (Denis), the Peasants (Loustaunau-Lacau) and Pleven's party, the U.D.S.R. (Lanet). It thus represented every major shade of French opinion except the Communists. Its leaders, Daladier and Soustelle, are leaders of the opposition to the European Army plan. Their announced purpose was to study at first hand the Oder-Neisse territories which the Germans want to recover and a Polish paper, *Trybuna Ludu*, quotes Lebon as saying that the Oder-Neisse line "is extremely important to France."

German Social Democrats on Militarization: In this connection it is worth noting what few if any American papers reported—that in the debate at Bonn on December 2 Ollenhauer, leader of the German Social Democrats, opposed the bill submitted by the Adenauer government to amend the Basic Law of the West German Republic to enable it to raise armed forces for the European Army. Ollenhauer took the position that this would embarrass an East-West understanding and prejudice the position of Germany.

Just Like Wild Bill: Several commentators have pointed out that the desperadoes of the West, despite the romantic views of them derived by President Eisenhower from dime novels, favored the shot in the back as the safest and most expeditious mode of execution. Any doubt that the Eisenhower Administration is going to adopt different methods in dealing with government employes may be set at rest by (1) the Val R. Lorwin case and (2) the remarks Eisenhower made in "attacking McCarthyism" at his December 2 press conference. Eisenhower backtracked on the Wild Bill Hickock speech in which he spoke of the right to confront one's accuser, and said this did not apply to government employes. He also said any subversives located by a Congressional committee will be removed just as promptly as any others. Now Lorwin, a former State Department employe, is to be tried for perjury. He denied in 1950 that he had been a Communist in 1935, and the indictment came just a few days short of the statute of limitations. Since Lorwin has been out of the government for several years (after clearance in

Extra! Elizabeth Bentley Exposes Wire-Tap Drive

Last week's issue, "Exposing: The Fallacies in The Wire-Tap Drive," had hardly appeared on the newsstands when it was unexpectedly confirmed by Elizabeth Bentley herself. Miss Bentley was asked about wire-tapping by Raymond P. Brandt, chief Washington correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, when she appeared on Meet-the-Press Sunday December 6. Her answers, though strikingly at variance with Attorney General Brownell and FBI Chief Hoover, were not considered newsworthy by the Associated Press. And so we give the text here as transcribed by NBC:

Q. Attorney General Brownell recommended to the Jenner Committee that there be legislation on wire-tapping. In your contacts with these people, do you think wire-tapping, had [it] been legalized, would have helped make a stronger case against them?

A. In other words, you mean you'd be able to use the information which you obtained through wire-tapping not just as an information lead but as actual concrete evidence?

Q. You can divulge it to a great many people. Under the law, you cannot divulge what you get from wire-tapping.

A. Probably not in the case of my Soviet agents, because we were so frightened of telephones we never said anything over them. That's been my own experience.

Brandt was startled and repeated the question. This time the romantic Miss Bentley varied her answer:

Q. The real agents did not use the telephone?

A. We used the telephone, yes, but our code was so mixed up that an outsider could not have gotten and understood it.

The first answer, that they were so frightened of the telephone that they never said anything over them, is not quite the same as the second answer, that they used the telephone but kept conversations in code. But the two answers do agree in one respect—that wire-tapping would not have provided proof of espionage. They also dispose of the fallacies, still being propagated by editors who should know better, that Miss Bentley's collaborators were not prosecuted because (as the *Washington Post* said December 7 in an editorial, "The Silent Men"), "wire-tapping was used to expose these offenses."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loyalty proceedings) it is hard to see what purpose this cruel prosecution will serve other than to prove that the Administration can outdo McCarthy.

Subversion from The Sea: William Ullman's umteenth appearance before a Congressional investigating committee last week provided one new angle. Senator Welker of the Jenner committee asked him whether Harvey Cedars, N. J., (where Ullman and Gregory Silvermaster are in the building business) was on the sea. Ullman admitted that it was. Welker then wanted to know whether he ever had visitors from the ocean. Ullman pleaded the Fifth. Welker did not make clear whether he had in mind Russian submarines or indoctrinated mermaids.

Old School Tie Over Africa: Mr. Lyttleton, Secretary of State for the Colonies, in the course of explaining to the House of Commons why he deposed the Kabaka of Buganda: "I had a long talk with the Kabaka this morning. I did not wish to press him into further discussion of political matters more than he wished. He was alone. He feels very severely the loss of his sister, which I am sure the whole House deplores. (Hear, hear.) This conversation could not have been more friendly. It was extremely painful to me because of the dignity and correct bearing of the Kabaka in all these matters. It was all the more painful to me ["and his voice broke here" says the parliamentary reporter] because he is a member of my university and regiment and a friend of my son at Cambridge."

The Lesser Breeds Grow Fairer: Fair procedure was once the Anglo-Saxon pride but it was left to the lesser breeds to raise the elementary point during the UN debate on Korean atrocities. Despite Pakistan's anxiety for American military aid, its representative, Sir Zafrullah Khan, was bold enough to announce that he would abstain on the vote because there had been no hearing. Sir Zafrullah said he had no reason to believe the evidence manufactured but found the tendency not to hear all parties disquieting. The Indonesian delegate also felt the accused should have been given a chance to state their case. The resolution was dutifully voted, but many delegates noted that the documents presented by the American delegation turned out to cover only eight cases, all but one of which occurred in 1950, and that one the Imjin river affair of which we provided a glimpse in last week's issue.

Iran: The problem is a long way from being solved. The populace is not at all happy about recognizing Britain again and Britain is not at all happy about Herbert Hoover, Jr.'s, proposal that the marketing of Iranian oil in the future be handled by a consortium of American and British oil companies instead of by Anglo-Iranian alone. The net effect of "nationalization" seems to be Americanization of Iranian oil.

Chalk Up One for Fair Procedure: The National Labor Relations Board received two well deserved setbacks in the Circuit Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia last week in its effort to act as if the Butler bill were already law. That bill would deny the benefits of the NLRB to unions which the Subversive Activities Control Board found to be Communist dominated. The NLRB tried to withdraw collective bargaining privileges from the Fur Workers because Ben Gold, its leader, is under indictment (though not yet convicted) of falsely swearing in his Taft-Hartley non-Communist affidavit. The Board also threatened to withhold NLRB privileges from the Fur Workers, the U.E. and the American Communications Association unless their officer reaffirmed their Taft-Hartley oaths. The Circuit Court ruled against the NLRB in appeals from both actions and Judge Bazelon commented, "To impose this penalty upon the great mass of innocent union members is as reckless as firing a shotgun into a crowd of people in an attempt to stop one who is picking their pockets."

To Be Filed But Not Forgotten: On December 7, 1953, twelfth anniversary of Pearl Harbor, Air Secretary Harold E. Talbott made a speech announcing that the U.S. would help Japan build another air force.

Convulsions at the ACLU

The directors of the American Civil Liberties Union are still trying to rewrite its principles against the wishes of its rank-and-file. The *Weekly* in its issue of October 31 disclosed (1) that the directors had sent out three proposed policy statements which would have accepted much of the premises and mechanisms of the American Inquisition, (2) that these had been overwhelmingly rejected in a referendum by the ACLU's affiliates and (3) that the National Board was preparing to set aside the results.

The sequel is now provided by the December issue of the bulletin published by the Northern California branch, the most militant of the ACLU's affiliates. The final vote had shown a majority of 2300 votes against the proposed policy statements. To avoid anything so barefaced as a Board vote to override, the executive committee of the Chicago affiliate was repolled by telephone. It was announced that Chicago, one of the largest affiliates, had shifted and that (under the ACLU's complex weighted system of voting) there was now a 2500 vote majority in favor of the policy statements. But on November 12 the Chicago executive committee adopted a motion to return to its original position.

Perhaps as a result the biennial conference, at which the whole dispute would have been aired, was postponed from Thanksgiving week-end until next February. The national board and the national committee are 3-to-1 for the change in policy. The affiliates, on the other hand, cast all but 600 of their 16,000 votes against it. The rank-and-file in February may yet save the ACLU from abandoning its traditional libertarian principles.

TO AN ANXIOUS SUBSCRIBER

A Mr. J. H. B. in upstate New York was good enough to subscribe early in November and now inquires anxiously why the expiration date under his name and address has not been changed. Other sharp eyed readers may be asking the same question. The answer is that the new plates for renewals are going to be made all at once, for reasons of efficiency and economy. The fact that the change has not yet appeared on your name plate does not mean that your renewal has gone astray. Also—those who subscribe early lose nothing thereby. The renewal counts from your expiration date, not from the date of renewal. But those readers who have sent in their renewals early—an amazingly large number—have saved our tiny office force the burden of handling all renewals in one mad rush. They have also brought the encouraging news that the *Weekly* can face its second year with confidence. Renew now if you can, and give a gift subscription to help us grow. The response so far has given yours truly fresh heart.

I. F. Stone

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two Appeals to The Courts Against The Witch Hunt

Sooner or later, the courts will be forced to interfere with the witch hunt. There is ample precedent for such interference in past cases where the courts intervened to protect property rights from Congressional investigation. The value of filing motions to quash subpoenas and applications for injunctions (just like Jay Cooke and Harry Sinclair) is that such actions, though unsuccessful at first, will serve to build a record of sober affidavit and pleading which must eventually have their impact on the courts.

One such action was initiated in the Federal district court in New York last week by Mrs. Eleanor Hutner, who appeared as a witness in executive session during McCarthy's Fort Monmouth hearings.* She asked that McCarthy be enjoined from questioning her again in public session. Judge Clancy refused her petition on December 8 but her counsel, Victor Rabinowitz, says an appeal will be taken.

In her petition, Mrs. Hutner said her employment at Fort Monmouth terminated ten years ago, that she has had no contact since with Fort Monmouth or the Signal Corps, that her job required no technical training and that she had no access to confidential or secret material. Mrs. Hutner at an executive session of the McCarthy committee on October 13 denied that she had ever committed espionage, or given classified material to any Communist or to the Rosenbergs. Mrs. Hutner did not invoke the Fifth amendment until asked about her personal political beliefs.

An injunction was asked on the ground that the legislation under which the Government Operations Committee was established (see text in the *Weekly* for July 25) gave it no authority to investigate "subversion" or possible commission of crime. No purpose would be served, it was pleaded, by recalling Mrs. Hutner for a public session, except to hurt her health and reputation. (Another woman witness in the Fort Monmouth hearings had a miscarriage; she was threatened with the electric chair.) The application said the hearing resembled a grand jury proceeding, except that there were constant "leaks" to the press and the supposedly executive sessions were attended "by friends and perhaps relatives of the Senator."

* An article by Walter Millis, "The Scandal at Fort Monmouth," in the New York *Herald-Tribune* (Dec. 8) supports the charges made six weeks earlier by this *Weekly* ("McCarthy's Hoax and The Real Radar Scandal," Oct. 24) and says McCarthy's hearings have wrecked this "sensitive military installation . . . more thoroughly than any Soviet saboteur could have dreamed of doing."

The Informer: Self-Portrayed

"The informer is different, particularly the ex-Communist informer. He risks little. He sits in security and uses his special knowledge to destroy others. He has that special information to give because he knows these others' faces, voices and lives, because he once lived within their confidence, in a shared faith. . . . If he had not done those things he would have no use as an informer. Because he has that use, the police protect him. When they whistle, he fetches a soiled bone of information. . . . He is no longer a man. He is free only to the degree in which he understands what he is doing and why he must do it. Let every ex-Communist look unblinkingly at that image. It is himself."—*Whittaker Chambers: Witness*, p. 454.

A Drive to Coerce Informing

A similar motion to quash subpoenas issued by the Velde committee was denied by Federal Judge Goodman in San Francisco. There the grounds were narrow—that the subpoenas failed to specify where the hearings would be held. The action was brought by the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California, on behalf of eight witnesses.

"All of them," the Northern California ACLU explains, "either dropped out of the Communist party or were expelled from four to eight years ago. Several of them have had repeated visits from FBI agents who have sought unsuccessfully to secure names of persons who were in the party with them. One witness, who lives in a small town, has had two agents come to his home once a month during a six months period. The agents suggested that unless he cooperated with them he would not be able to stay in the town. . . ."

Don't Rue It, Do It.

PLEASE RENEW NOW

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

12-14-53

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205

301 E. Capitol St., S.E.

Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED